

REMARKS

The present request is submitted in response to the Advisory Action dated January 17, 2007 and in further response to the final Office Action dated October 11, 2006.

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner noted that the Applicant's Request for Reconsideration filed January 3, 2007 did not place the application in condition for allowance, because the Applicant's arguments were not found persuasive. Specifically, the Examiner maintained in the Advisor Action that the cited patent to Bergler discloses the subject matter of amended claim 1, arguing that "although the adjusting of the switch lever is not automatic in response to a function of the pressure, the mechanical response to the adjusting of the switch lever is considered automatic". The Examiner argues further that the claim does not set forth that means automatically adjust as an automatic response to a function of the pressure, only that the means are actuated as a function of the pressure.

The Examiner maintains that the mechanical response to the adjusting of the switch lever is considered automatic, i.e., when the lever is actuated, the stroke is automatically, although mechanically, adjusted.

Therefore, in light of these comments in the Advisory Action, the Applicant has amended claim 1 again in this further Request for Reconsideration to specifically recite that *means is provided for automatically adjusting the*

*oscillation stroke smoothly between the maximum and minimum stroke during the sawing process, as **an automatic response to** a function of the pressure of the saw blade (3) against a work piece to be sawn.*

Based on the Examiner's comments in the Advisory Action, the Applicant believes that the above amendment to claim 1 specifically addresses the Examiner's grounds for the final rejection and further, that the amendment to claim 1 renders claim 1 allowable over the Bergler reference.

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-10 are patentable over the cited art. The Applicant further requests withdrawal of the final rejection and reconsideration of the claims as herein presented.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Michael J. Striker /

Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 27233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700